

Present:

Eileen Kuster-Collins	<i>Chairperson</i>
Mary Mathews	<i>Member</i>
Toma Holley	<i>Member * arrived 7:30</i>
Lisa Buckley	<i>Alternate Member</i>
Donald Yacopino	<i>Chief Building Inspector</i>
Steve Knowlton	<i>Legal Counsel</i>

Minutes of the March 18, 2014 meeting are approved.

Application 1: 57 Burd Street. Orville Mann Jr. Application for two signs and recommendation to Zoning Board of Appeals. Property is in RMU zoning district.

Building Inspector Review: Signage at Burd Street meets zoning requirements. Signage on west wall requires a variance for a parallel sign on façade not facing a street.

Board Review Based Upon:

1. The application;
2. Building Inspector review;
3. Testimony of applicant Russell Grant;
4. ARB members knowledge of the site;
5. Site visits by members;
6. No testimony from the public.

Board Findings:

1. The board discussed the location and agreed that the placement indicated for both the A & B signs is appropriate. Member Mathews recommended that the west sign align with some element of the building so as not to appear random. The applicant agreed.

Conclusions:

1. Having no further comment by the public, the public hearing is closed on a motion by Member Mathews seconded by Member Buckley and is approved by a vote of 4-0
2. The Architectural Review Board has considered the factors set forth in Section 360-5.13D of the Village of Nyack Code.
3. The board concludes that the design, materials and placement of the proposed sign are appropriate for the building, and are compatible with nearby buildings.
4. On a motion by Member Mathews seconded by Member Buckley the board finds that the application be approved with a positive recommendation to the ZBA, and subject to the following condition as agreed to by the applicant: 1. The west facing sign will align with an element on the building such as the window trim. Approved by a vote of 4-0.

Application 2: 162 Main Street. Communal Kitchen. Sign application. Property is in DMU Overlay zoning district. Application is to replace parallel sign facing Main Street and add lettering to awning valance.

Building Inspector Review: A variance will be required for wording on valance other than store name.

Board Review Based Upon:

1. The application;
2. Building Inspector review;
3. Testimony of applicant;
4. ARB members knowledge of the site;

5. Site visits by members;
6. No testimony from the public.

Board Findings:

1. The board suggested that the logo signage proposed for the east side of the building be also utilized in the front parallel sign as it consistently represents the business. The applicant agreed.
2. The board discussed the verbiage on the sign other than the name and would render a positive recommendation if the applicant wishes to pursue a variance.

Conclusions:

1. Having no further comment by the public, the public hearing is closed on a motion by Member Buckley seconded by Member Mathews and is approved by a vote of 5-0.
2. The Architectural Review Board has considered the factors set forth in Section 360-5.13D of the Village of Nyack Code.
3. The board concludes that subject to conditions, the design, materials and placement of the proposed sign are appropriate for the building, and are compatible with nearby buildings.
4. On a motion by Member Collins seconded by Member Mathews the board finds that the application be approved subject to the following condition as agreed to by the applicant:
 1. The signage on the front façade will incorporate the circular logo as indicated on the east sign. The drawings will be submitted for interim review by two members.

Approved by a vote of 5-0.

Application 3: 15 Tallman Place David and Deborah Alter. Application to relocate rear door.

Building Inspector Review: Proposal complies with zoning regulations.

Board Review Based Upon:

1. The application and drawings dated ;
2. Building Inspector review;
3. Testimony of architect Kier Levesque;
4. ARB members knowledge of the site;
5. Site visits by members;
6. Testimony from the public: Debra Flocco and Bill Gnichtel who requested to see the drawings but had no comments.

Board Findings:

1. The board finds the application complete and appropriate in design.

Conclusions:

1. Having no further comment by the public, the public hearing is closed on a motion by Member Holley seconded by Member Buckley, approved by a vote of 5-0.
2. The Architectural Review Board has considered the factors set forth in Section 360-5.15C of the Village of Nyack Code.
3. The board concludes that the proposed alterations are in harmony with and compatible with the existing design and architecture of the Village.
4. On a motion by Member Buckley seconded by Member Holley the board finds that the application be approved as submitted.

Approved by a vote of 5-0

Application 4: 296 Main Street. O’Leary Insurance Agency. Sign application.

Inspector Review: A variance will be required for more than one sign erected parallel to the face of the building and for signage greater than area permitted

Board Review Based Upon:

1. The application;
2. Building Inspector review;
3. Testimony of applicant Kristian O’Leary;
4. ARB members knowledge of the site;
5. Site visits by members;
6. There was no testimony from the public.

Board Findings:

1. The board discussed that on prior applications, it had been agreed this building was to have a signage program as it is a multi-tenant establishment. The board expressed concern that a large area of façade will be covered by tenant signage at this gateway location and finds it inappropriate. The board recommends that the applicant ask the owner to allow the O’Leary sign be placed on half of the David’s sign so the existing area coverage of signage is maintained on the west elevation. The board noted that the sign is noncompliant and creates a billboard effect deemed inappropriate.

Conclusions:

1. The public hearing remains open. The applicant agrees to review the board recommendations with the building owner and will return.

Application 5: 400 High Avenue. NYLO Hotel. Application for a freestanding sign. Property is in M zoning district.

Building Inspector Review: A variance is required for a freestanding pole sign.

Board Review Based Upon:

1. The application;
2. Building Inspector review;
3. Applicant did not appear;
4. ARB members knowledge of the site;
5. Site visits by members;
6. No testimony from the public.

Board Findings:

1. Although the applicant did not appear, the board offered the following opinions: the height of the sign was considered excessive and not in scale with the building. The pole sign is not a permitted sign but would be considered appropriate in this location if the height is reduced.
2. The board discussed the lettering and found it appropriate. The secondary wording below the name sign was still considered less appropriate and the applicant would need to insure that no led or moving images are part of the application.
3. The applicant had in prior discussion, agreed to consider the use of a water tower type structure as a device to conceal the mountings. The board considers that favorable.

Conclusions:

1. Having no comment by the public, the public hearing remains open.

The meeting adjourned at 8:10pm

Eileen Kuster-Collins, Chairperson